



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,645	11/21/2000	Steven J. Kruy	MSFT-05581/140709.1	9553
41505	7590	11/16/2004		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			EXAMINER AL HASHEMI, SANA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/717,645

Applicant(s)

KRUY ET AL.

Examiner

Sana Al-Hashemi

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) * | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2161

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims; 1-32 are rejected.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, and 9-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 7, 9-19, and 25-32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,166) in view of Bendert et al. (US Patent No. 5,761,678).

1. Regarding Claims 1, 9, 25 and 26, Eisenberg discloses a computerized method for maintaining versions of project data, the project data, having at least one project data attribute, the method comprising (see column 29, lines 23-26, Eisenberg):

receiving an updated value for the project data attribute (see column 5, lines 12-15, Eisenberg);

Eisenberg does not clearly teach the step of saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior

Art Unit: 2161

to the update. However, Bendert teaches the step of saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update (see column 7, lines 1-10, Bendert¹). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of saving previous version instead of freezing the previous version as taught by Eisenberg and the motivation would be to do so is to provide a full record with all it's versions to the end users which in other words provides all information existed for each project (see column 5, lines 23-27, Eisenberg);

creating a current version of the project data, wherein the current version of the project data contains the updated value (see column 5, lines 28-35, Eisenberg).

2. Regarding Claims 2, 10, 26, and 29, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a computerized method wherein saving a previous version of the project data includes setting an end time field in a first data structure to a value a current time (see column 5, lines 39-41, Eisenberg);

wherein creating a current version of the project data includes the tasks of:

creating a second data structure (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg);

setting a start time field in the second data structure to a value comprising the current time used to set the end time field of the first data structure (see column 15, lines 27-29, Eisenberg);

setting an end time field in the second data structure to a value representing a most recent version of the object (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg).

¹ Examiner interprets the clone count disclosed by the prior art correspond to the value claimed.

Art Unit: 2161

3. Regarding Claims 3, 11, 27, and 30, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a computerized method further comprising setting a property value field to the updated value (see column 19, lines 46-49, Eisenberg).

4. Regarding Claims 4, 5, 12, and 13, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a computerized method wherein the value representing the most recent value is a blank or null value (see column 19, lines 42-45, Eisenberg).

5. Regarding Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, and 18, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a computerized method wherein the data structure comprises at least one row in a database and the database is a relational database (see column 13, lines 37-46, Eisenberg)

6. Regarding Claim 8, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a computer-readable medium having a data structure stored thereon, the medium comprising:

a first field comprising an identifier for a project data issue (see column 15, lines 1-2, Eisenberg);

a second field comprising a start time (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg);

a third field comprising an end time (see column 19, lines 16-18, Eisenberg);

a fourth field comprising a project data property value for the project data issue (see column 19, lines 42-50, Eisenberg); and

wherein the second and third field define a range of time that the project data property value for the project data issue identified by the first field has the project data property value in the fourth field (see column 19, lines 8-15, Eisenberg).

7. Regarding Claims 16, and 31, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a computerized system comprising:

Art Unit: 2161

a processor and a computer-readable medium (Fig. 1, 106, 100, and 110, Eisenberg);
an operating environment executing on the processor from the computer-readable medium (Fig. 1, 102, Eisenberg); and

a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of data associated with a project, the data associated with a project including a project data element (see column 18, lines 10-20, Eisenberg).

8. Regarding Claims 17, and 32, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a computerized system wherein the project tracking system comprises:

a visual interface operative to display the data associated with the project and receive an update to the project data element (see column 13, lines 9-17, Eisenberg);

a project database operative to store a new version of data associated with a project upon receipt of an update to the project data element (see column 18, lines 35-38, Eisenberg).

9. Regarding Claim 19, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert discloses a method for displaying a property value for a version of project data, the method comprising:

determining a selected version of the project data (see column 4, lines 62-67, Bendert);

reading a selected property value for the selected version (see column 4, lines 52-56, Bendert);

reading a second property value for at least one other version of project data (see column 5, lines 1-6, Bendert);

comparing the selected property value to the second property value (see column 7, lines 1-4, Bendert).

Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,166) in view of Bendert et al. (US Patent No. 5,761,678) and further in view of Bereiter et al (US Patent No. 5,917,492).

10. Regarding Claims 20, 21, and 22, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert does not explicitly disclose if the selected property value and the second property value are different, then highlighting the selected property value. However, Bereiter et al. discloses the method of highlighting the selected property value. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify/add the highlighting the selected property value to the Eisenberg invention with the motivation of making it attract the user attention to the most recent updates.

11. Regarding Claims 23, and 24, the combination of Eisenberg and Bendert in view of Bereiter discloses the method wherein highlighting the selected property value includes providing a predetermined background color for the selected property value, providing a predetermined background color for the selected property value, displaying a glyph beside the selected property (see column 8, lines 34-67, Bereiter). Bereiter does not disclose the displaying of the selected property value in a strike-through font, displaying a squiggle under the selected property, blinking the selected property value. However. It would have been obvious to add the strike-through font, displaying a squiggle under the selected property, blinking to the selected property value with the motivation they are well known, comment, and efficient way to draw the attention.

Art Unit: 2161


Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4013. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023. Any response to this office action should be mailed to: The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. Or telefax at phone number (703) 872-9306. For formal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT". Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6th Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

Sana Al-Hashemi
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
November 4, 2004


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100